



University
of Glasgow

Our ref: FOI Review 2011/21 – F0177506

25 October 2011

Mr Wolfram Bayer
Request-84500-e2e24ef4@whatdotheyknow.com

Dear Mr Bayer,

Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 – Review Outcome

I write with regard to your request for a review of the University's response to your Freedom of Information request (Our Ref FOI 2011/223-F0166064). Your areas of concern relate to:

1. *David Newall on numerous occasions has claimed that the implementation of this system will result in saving of £500,000 per year. You now tell me that you do not know that annual cost of MyCampus. Without knowing the annual cost of MyCampus how did David Newall know that there would be an annual saving of £500,000? Please speak to him as he must have known the recurrent cost of MyCampus before making such a claim.*

2. *Replying to another Fol request:*

<http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/61508/response/157150/attach/2/Response%20F0130074.pdf> you released the following information: "Campus software maintenance – following purchase of the above licences a software contract then provides support from Oracle including the provision of ongoing new releases. The annual cost of this maintenance is £264,473 per annum." You now say that the support cost is £160,000 per year. Which figure is correct?

3. *I have found it very difficult to believe that you have not budgeted for the consultancy costs.*

Finally, a while ago you claimed: "The Project Board, chaired by David Newall, Secretary of Court, has responsibility for costs and these are recorded and monitored in accordance with the governance structure." See:

http://whatdotheyknow.com/request/working_practices_for_student_li#incoming-26837

Considering the fact that you cannot account for the cost of this project I wish to suggest that the project Board, chaired by David Newall, have failed miserably.

Your first point asks how, without knowing the annual cost of MyCampus, David Newall knew that there would be an annual saving of £500,000. You will know from your reading of responses to other FoI requests that the figure of £500,000 was an estimate based on an analysis of selected areas where savings were expected to be made. Similarly, any figure based on a comparison of annual costs prior to the transition and anticipated costs for the reworked range of processes that would be carried out annually once Campus Solutions was implemented, would also be an approximation.

The second point you raise is about annual licence costs. Please accept apologies on behalf of the University, as the response that you should have received was that there are no annual licence costs, since a one-off licence fee amounting to £758,095 was paid at the commencement of the project for the perpetual right to use the software. No further licence fees are due, unless there is an increase in staff numbers (Full Time Equivalents) which is not envisaged in the foreseeable future. The figure of £160,000 (including VAT) provided to you was the sum budgeted as at September 2011 for 2011-12 for the software maintenance contract for Campus Solutions, which covers support from Oracle including the ongoing provision of new releases. The figure of £264,473 provided in response to another request in March 2011 was based on the actual cost of the software maintenance contract in the two financial years from 1 August 2008 to 31 July 2010. Since the amounts were incorrectly added together, the actual expenditure over that period was £284,473 rather than £264,473.

I have noted the comments you make in your third and final point. I am satisfied that the response sent to you on 27 September meets the obligations of the University under the terms of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002.

I confirm that this letter signifies the end of the University's internal procedures. If you remain dissatisfied with the outcome of this review you can appeal to the Scottish Information Commissioner. You must submit your complaint in writing to the Commissioner within 6 months of receiving this response to review letter. The Commissioner may be contacted as follows:

Scottish Information Commissioner
Kinburn Castle
Doubledykes Road
St. Andrews
Fife KY16 9DS
Tel: 01334 464610
Email: enquiries@itspublicknowledge.info

Please be advised there is a right of appeal to the Court of Session against the Commissioner's decisions, but only on a point of law.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Anne B Mitchell
Corporate Projects Manager